

Corey Woodby

From: windtester@aol.com
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2016 12:53 PM
To: Corey Woodby; The Office of Senator Robertson
Subject: Opposition to Senate Bills # 39 & 40

Dear Mr. Woodby and Senator Robertson,

As a resident of the 14th district and owner of property in Michigan that is adjacent to existing State owned property, I would like to formally state my opposition to two Senate Bills up for consideration.

The first, Senate Bill # 39 contains a number of stipulations that would be detrimental to maintaining open access to state hunting lands; not in keeping with the stated purpose most, if not all, of these lands were originally set aside for. Specifically:

- Language that would expand the ability of private individuals or corporations to purchase state hunting lands while allowing for the process to be confidential; clearly a threat to the future of public recreation on public lands. (This would be extremely distressing if this were to result in development activity that is disrupting to the local ecosystems.)
- Language that will make it more difficult for the state to acquire land where long term wildlife and forest management can be conducted.
- Language establishing a lengthy process, including public hearings that the DNR would be required to conduct if requested to remove an existing berm (or gates or other barriers), even if the request addresses only a single berm on a single trail. With tens of thousands of berms, many serving vital wildlife and natural resource purposes, this would create an enormous burden on the DNR requiring extraordinary amounts of time, energy, and money that is better directed towards managing our wildlife and other forest resources.
- Wording that could facilitate lawsuits against conservation officers carrying out their duties. (This should be avoided at all cost; for all law enforcement officers!)
- Language that would limit the use of state funds to manage "non-game" such as golden-winged warblers. This would stifle fundraising opportunities of the DNR and conservation organizations and essentially redirect federal dollars from Michigan to other states.

Additionally, Senate Bill # 40, would enable the funds intended for state land ownership to be re-directed to other purposes. While the intent of the bill appears to be to simplify the process to use available funds for valid Natural Resource activities, the language in the bill needs to (at least) be strengthened to prevent any misdirection.

Thank you for considering my opinion on these initiatives.

Sincerely,
Timothy G. Tomas